PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

Translation INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

1						
ority						
ad/or ative						
yond ental						
oles						
(see						
Section 802 of the Administrative Instructions). 4. This report contains indications relating to the following items:						
y;						
: a b						

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/007546

Вох	No. I	Basis of the report		
1.		d to the language, this report is based on the internation	nal application in the language in	which it was filed, unless otherwise
		report is based on translations from the original language in is the language of a translation furnished for the purpointernational search (Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)) publication of the international application (Rule 12.4)	oses of:	·
2.	receiving this report	nternational application as originally filed/furnished	report is based on (replacement)	
	page	2	received by this Authority on	17.05.2005 by fax
	page	:s*	received by this Authority on	
	the o	claims:		
	nos.			as originally filed/furnished
	nos.	*	as amended (togethe	er with any statement) under Article 19
	nos.	* 1-10	received by this Authority on	17.05.2005 by fax
	nos.	*	received by this Authority on	
	shee			as originally filed/furnished
	shee	ts*	received by this Authority on	
	a sec	quence listing and/or any related table(s) see Supplems	ental Box Relating to Sequence I	isting.
3.	The	amendments have resulted in the cancellation of: the description, pages the claims, nos. the drawings, sheets/figs the sequence listing (specify): any table(s) related to sequence listing (specify):		
4.		report has been established as if (some of) the amend have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as fil the description, pages	ed, as indicated in the Supplement	ntal Box (Rule 70.2(c)).
		the claims, nos.		
		the drawings, sheets/figs		
		the sequence listing (specify):		
		any table(s) related to sequence listing (specify):		
*	If item 4 a	pplies, some or all of those sheets may be marked "supe	erseded."	

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/007546

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Art citations and explanations sup			ticle 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; porting such statement	
1.	Statement			
	Novelty (N)	Claims	1-10	YES
		Claims		NO
	Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1-10	YES
		Claims		NO
	Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-10	YES
		Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations (Rule 70.7)

Reference is made to the following document:

D1: US-A-2 287 130 (RAMEY) 23 June 1942 (1942-06-23)

Document D1 is considered the prior art closest to the subject matter of claim 1 and discloses (the references between parentheses refer to that document) a coolant circuit (figure 1) of a motor vehicle (page 1, column 1, lines 1 and 2), comprising a coolant ("water", page 2, column 1, line 33), a coolant pump (17) with a coolant outlet (11); a retarder (20), which has a stator and a central ring (44) and the working medium of which is the coolant, the central ring corresponding to that part of the working chamber of the retarder which in the flow direction of the coolant is disposed behind a coolant-conducting retarder inlet region; a reversing valve (13) in the flow direction before the retarder (20) and a bypass section (14) for bypassing the retarder (20), so that the retarder (20) can be connected to and disconnected from the coolant circuit

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/007546

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

(page 3, column 1, line 72 - column 2, line 7); the coolant pump (17) being arranged in the flow direction before the retarder so that it pumps coolant into the retarder (via line 20') when the retarder is connected and pumps coolant past the retarder via the bypass section (14) when the retarder is disconnected.

Document D1 differs from the subject matter of the fist claim in that it does not provide any quantitative information concerning the total flow resistance from the outlet of the coolant pump (11) to the central ring (44) of the retarder, which according to the claim is less when the retarder is connected than the total flow rate resistance of the coolant circuit to be overcome in the non-braking mode.

Document D1 differs further from the subject matter of the first claim in that in document D1:

- the coolant pump, the reversing valve and the retarder are not arranged in the coolant circuit in the sequence stated in the claim when the retarder is connected, that is directly one behind the other in the direction of flow; and/or
- the stator of the retarder has only one hole (in the claim: "holes") for supplying the working chamber of the retarder with working medium.

As a result of these differences, the subject

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/007546

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

matter of the first claim is novel (PCT Article 33(2)).

A person skilled in the art of retarders would not reduce the resistance from the outlet of the coolant pump to the central ring of the retarder to below a predefined reference value (to less than, for example, the claimed total flow rate resistance of the coolant circuit in the nonbraking mode) when the retarder is connected, without thereby being inventive. This is due to the fact that during braking, the retarder must generate a large degree of resistance and therefore it is not obvious to reduce the resistance (in, for example, line 20') between the coolant pump and the central ring (since that resistance, even if minimal, results in better braking power). For this reason, the subject matter of the first claim can be considered inventive.

Claims 2 to 10 are dependent on claim 1 and therefore likewise meet the PCT requirements for novelty and inventive step.

PCT/EP2004/007546

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

The application does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 6 because the subject matter of claims 1 to 3 and 8 to 10 is unclear.

- Claim 1: the subject matter for which protection is sought is not clearly defined. An attempt is made to define the subject matter by the result to be achieved (a comparison of the total resistance of a sub-system during braking and the total resistance of a different sub-system in the non-braking mode). Thus only the problem to be solved is indicated, without the technical features needed to achieve that result being specified (for example how the resistances are generated). As a result, the subject matter of the claim is not clearly defined (PCT Article 6).
- Claim 2: here also the subject matter for which protection is sought is not clearly defined. An attempt is made to define the subject matter by the result to be achieved (a difference in resistance of up to 30%) Thus only the problem to be solved is indicated, without the technical features needed to achieve that result being specified.
- Claims 1 and 2: these claims contain the reference number "2.1 " in relation to the central ring.

 That number cannot, however, be found in the

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/007546

INIE	PCT/EP2004/007546				
Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application				
	drawings, resulting in a lack of clarity regarding				
	the claimed central ring.				
4	Claims 1, 3 and 8 to 10: claim 1 contains sections				
	which overlap completely with claim 3 $(1.6.1)$,				
	with claim 8 $(1.6.2)$, with claim 9 $(1.6.3)$ and				
	with claim $10 \ (1.6.4)$. This double claiming of				
	the same features is confusing to the reader and				
	results in a lack of clarity (PCT Article 6).				